

V. REMARKS

Allowable subject matter

The Office Action asserts that claims 1-4 and 6-8 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Applicant rewrote the claims in this manner. As a result, it is believed that these claims are now allowable over the applied art.

The Office Action asserts that claim 27 would be allowable if rewritten to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112, second paragraph and to include all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Applicant rewrote claim 20 by incorporating the features of the original claim 27 (now canceled) and the intervening claim 24 which is now canceled. Claims 21-23 and 28 remained as previously presented that depend on amended claim 20.

Applicant also amends claims 20 and 25 to overcome the rejections under 35 USC 112.

Therefore, it is believed that claims 20-23, 25, 26 and 28 are now allowable over the applied art.

Rejections under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a)

Claims 9, 10, 12, 19-21, 23 and 28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Titlebaum (U.S. Patent No. 6,549,774) in view of Griffin (U.S. Patent No. 6,031,492). Claims 11, 13, 22 and 24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Titlebaum in view of Griffin has applied the claims of nine and 20 and further in view of Holloway (U.S. Patent Application Publication No. 2004/0204192). Claims 14, 25 and 26 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over

Titlebaum in view of Griffin and Halloway as applied the claims 13 and 24 and further in view of Smith (U.S. Patent No. 5,266,922). The rejections are respectfully traversed.

Applicant cancels claims 9-14 and 19 that are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as unpatentable. Therefore, the rejection as the applied to these claims is now moot.

Claim 20, as amended, now includes the features of 27 as indicated by the Examiner contains allowable subject matter. Claim 27 is now canceled.

Claims 21, 23 and 28 depend from claim 20 and includes all of the features of claim 20. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 20 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Also, Claims 22, 25 and 26 depend from claim 20 and includes all of the features of claim 20. Thus, it is respectfully submitted that the dependent claims are allowable at least for the reason claim 20 is allowable as well as for the features they recite.

Withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

In view of the foregoing, reconsideration of the application and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested. Should the Examiner believe anything further is desirable in order to place the application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact Applicants' representative at the telephone number listed below.

Should additional fees be necessary in connection with the filing of this paper or if a Petition for Extension of Time is required for timely acceptance of the same, the

Application No.: 10/808,508


OMY-0035
(80276-0035)

Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 18-0013 for any such fees and Applicant(s) hereby petition for such extension of time.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: August 27, 2006

By:


Carl Schaukowitch
Reg. No. 29,211

RADER, FISHMAN & GRAUER PLLC

1233 20th Street, N.W. Suite 501

Washington, D.C. 20036

Tel: (202) 955-3750

Fax: (202) 955-3751

Customer No. 23353

Enclosure(s): Amendment Transmittal

DC287135.DOC